

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information/Misinformation	Case:	N6
---------------------------	---	--------------	----

Event	Silodor Open Pairs	Event DIC	Candace Kushner
Date	03/17/2016	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦ ¹	1♥	1♠	2♥
Dbl ²	Pass	2♠	Pass
2NT	Pass	3♦	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Could be short, <15 HCP
2: Explained as 3 card ♠

Hand Record

Board	11	N	Douglas Simson	
Dealer	S	♠ KJ10 ♥ KQ92 ♦ 108 ♣ 9742		
Vul	None			
W	Emmanuel Vacakis		E	Gary Near
♠ (void) ♥ A1074 ♦ KQ63 ♣ AQ1083			♠ A9762 ♥ J6 ♦ 542 ♣ J65	
		S	Jeff Aker	
		♠ Q8543 ♥ 853 ♦ AJ97 ♣ K		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Made 3	E/W +400	♥ K

Facts Determined at the Table

North/South inquired about the double prior to West's 2NT, and were informed that it was a support double, showing three card spade support. The director was called the first time spades were led and West showed out. N/S felt they would have defended differently if they had been made aware that the double showed values rather than support. They also felt that West had Unauthorized Information from the explanation that influenced his bidding.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director gave West's hand to five expert players, along with the details of the auction. All five elected to bid over 2♠, establishing that pass was not a logical alternative.

Director Ruling

As the player poll established that passing was not a logical alternative, the UI issue was deemed moot. As for the explanation given, both E/W convention cards listed support doubles. The explanation of the partnership agreement was therefore correct, and per Law 75C, this was a case of mistaken bid rather than mistaken explanation. Therefore, no adjustment to the table result was required under the Laws.

Director's Ruling	3NT by W, Made 3, E/W +400
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and they attended the hearing. They argued that West had UI from the explanation of the double, making it much more attractive to bid over 2♠ than it would be without the UI. Also, during the questioning about the double, West responded to whether the partnership played support double with, "that is our agreement." This gave UI to East, who now knew that West did not have three spades, allowing him to not rebid 3♠. (This last argument was given in committee only, not to the screening director. It is important, however, that the comment was made in response to a direct question, and it appeared to be an innocent response to that question, not an attempt to clue East in to the actual situation.)

Committee Findings

Was there misinformation? Everyone at the table concurred that the partnership agreement was that the double was support. Each convention card was so marked. So, there was no apparent MI.

Was there unauthorized information? Yes, West had UI that East thought that he held three spades. East had UI that West did not have three spades.

Did West's UI suggest other less successful logical alternatives over the choice he actually made? The directors polled five players and none of them passed 2♠. The AC does not know if any of those players seriously considered passing, but the committee judged that none of West's peers would consider doing so. The UI does not suggest 2NT over 3♠, which appears to be the main other logical alternative, so West is free to bid 2NT.

Did East's UI suggest other less successful logical alternatives over the choice he made? The AC believed that East would know that West did not have three spades when he bid 2NT, and that 3♦ is normal, since 2NT shows both minors with longer diamonds. 3♣ would have shown both minors with longer clubs. If West really did have three spades, he would not pass 3♦, so there's no problem bidding this, and when partner bids 3NT, there is no way he holds spades. All in all, it appears that no infraction of abuse of UI occurred. Therefore, the table result stands.

Did the appeal have merit? N/S brought up new UI which may have been relevant. That alone is enough to provide merit, but the judgment that pass is not a LA seems non-obvious enough to allow merit, particularly when the non-offending side's result was a direct result of a possible infraction, and was so terrible that clear judgment might be hard to maintain.

Committee Decision	3NT by W, Made 3, E/W +400
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Mark Bartusek
Member	Jeff Goldsmith (scribe)
Member	Riggs Thayer
Member	Hendrik Sharples
Member	Craig Allen